

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 5-9, 11-13 and 37-46 are all the claims pending in the application.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3, 5-9, 11-13 and 38-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Polizzi (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0023158; hereinafter “Polizzi”) in view of Albert et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,970,913; hereinafter “Albert”), in further view of DeBettencourt (U.S. Patent No. 6,279,001; hereinafter “DeBettencourt”), and claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Polizzi, Albert and DeBettencourt, in further view of Phaal (U.S. Patent No. 6,138,159).

Claim 1 is amended and recites a method for identifying a status corresponding to interactions between a remote application and a data source, comprising, *inter alia*, “generating a log file comprising an arbitrary set of parameters selectively established to reflect a status of a connection between the remote application and the data source, wherein the set of parameters are established by the remote application”.

The Examiner acknowledges that neither Polizzi nor Albert teach or suggest the claimed feature of “generating a log file comprising an arbitrary set of parameters selectively established to reflect a status of a connection between the remote application and the data source” and instead relies on DeBettencourt.

DeBettencourt discloses storing “status information, also referred to as the ‘state’ of a user’s session with the web server 102” where such a state is developed during a user’s

interaction with the web server (col. 5, lines 25-30), and that “the information to be logged can be configured for each server”. That is, DeBettencourt merely discloses that each server may be configured to log different information. However, DeBettencourt fails to teach or suggest establishing the parameters, that a log file comprises, by a remote application, as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable over the applied references. Applicant further submits that dependent claims 3, 5-9, 11-13 and 38-40 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 1.

Phaal fails to address the above-identified deficiencies of Polizzi, Albert and DeBettencourt. Accordingly, Applicant further submits that dependent claim 37 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency on claim 1.

New Claims

Applicant adds new claims 41-46, support for which may be found throughout the specification. Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are patentable at least by virtue of the subject matter recited therein, and at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 1.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111, AND
STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW
U.S. Appln. No.: 09/750,432

Attorney Docket No.: A8645
IBM Ref.: STL919990134US2

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Rohit K. Krishna/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

Rohit K. Krishna
Registration No. 62,474

WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/142133

46159

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 31, 2008